

would say, Mr. Chairman, the President, the Vice President, the State Department, bipartisan Congress, Center for Marine Conservation, Green Peace, Scripps Institute of Oceanography and 11 other nations, they said build it and they will come. Eleven other nations, build it and save the dolphins, save all marine mammals, and 11 nations will come. And they did come.

Mr. Chairman, I would say: "Shoeless GEORGE MILLER, tell me it is not so. Please, Shoeless GEORGE MILLER, tell me it is not so, that you would offer this anti-environment amendment. Tell me, please, GEORGE MILLER, that one of the groups that oppose this was a group that wanted in California to stop trout and bass fishing because it hurt the fish.

Tell me it ain't so, shoeless GEORGE MILLER. Tell me that the other group that opposes this of all the environmental groups is the group that the unbomber supported. They spike trees to kill loggers. Tell me it ain't so, Mr. GEORGE MILLER. Tell me it ain't so."

For them to say that this is a fiscal issue is just wrong.

Let me give my colleagues some letters. Clinton-Gore administration State Department: "The amendment would seriously jeopardize important programs being undertaken by the IATCC." The President highlighted this. He had a Rose Garden signature, and the gentleman is trying to kill that. He tried to kill it for 2 years. This is his way to do it and claim fiscal responsibility.

The Center for Marine Conservation, Green Peace: "It will result in the death of dolphins, sea turtles, sharks and other bill fish."

Here is the Director of World Wildlife Fund: "IDCP program works. Consequently it should not be the target of Mr. MILLER's, quote, 'anti-environment action.'"

We hear all the time that we support things for special interest groups. Well, the groups we have are about 90 percent of the environmental groups, and we have got two groups, two special interests, that want to kill this bill. Do not let that happen. This is one of our most shining moments working together in a bipartisan way.

Here is the vote: overwhelming here in the House. Here it is right here. Do not throw that away. We always talk about when we can work together as a body, when we can support each other, when we can work on the environment together. This is one of those shining moments that the House did come together, the Senate did come together, the President signed it, the Vice President; he supports our position and against this amendment.

Please come back and help us.

We have our sports fishermen. This is tied to Mexico as well. Our sports fishermen work with Secretary of Mexico Carlos Comacho. Mexico has been part of this for 4 months, and guess what? They are already kicking in a share of the payment.

The act itself says that all the payments will be addressed, and they are under that auspices as we speak.

So this is an amendment with an attempt to kill the tuna-dolphin bill which the gentleman from California tried to kill for 2 years. Now he has that right. He felt it was wrong. But the overwhelming majority of this body, the other body, and all the other environmental organizations disagree with my friend from California.

We do not pay too much. I would ask my colleagues not to turn their backs on a program that has saved over 97,000 dolphins, 97,000, each year. The group that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is espousing controls the tuna-dolphin label. They stand to lose millions of dollars. Do we allow a group, a special interest group, to pocket money at the expense of the environment? And that is why the letter of this anti-environment amendment.

I would ask my colleagues, reject the Miller amendment. Stand for the bipartisan tuna-dolphin bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the George Miller of California amendment which reduces U.S. taxpayer subsidy for foreign tuna fishermen.

The International Dolphin Conservation Program Act of 1997 allows previously embargoed countries to export their tuna to the United States. In exchange for opening our markets, Congress required countries meet the legal and financial obligations of membership in the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), which regulates tuna fishing and the International Dolphin Conservation program. These obligations include funding the IATTC.

The operating expenses of the IATTC are to be divided between member countries based on the proportion of the amount of tuna which each nation harvests from the fisheries.

The key word is "proportion." The numbers speak for themselves. Historically, the United States has paid for 75% of the IATTC's operating expenses, but the U.S. share of the tuna catch is less than 40%. Should American taxpayers subsidize foreign fishing fleets by paying almost double our contribution? The State Department seems to think so.

It has proposed using taxpayer money to pay for "lapses" in the contribution for the IATTC. In other words, the State Department wants the American taxpayer to pay almost "double" our share rather than impose stipulations on those members who have delinquent financial obligations.

The George Miller of California amendment will reduce the U.S. financial contribution by \$1 million, meaning that the U.S. will still be paying for 50% of the IATTC's annual budget. Since contributions by other countries have been based in the large part on the amount paid by the United States, supporting this amendment would force other fishing nations to begin paying their fair share. The Miller amendment does not undermine the International Dolphin Conservation program, particularly the observer program, which is funded by the tuna vessels and not by country contributions.

Mr. Chairman, over the past nine years, American taxpayers have paid almost \$15 mil-

lion above our obligation under the Convention. Isn't it time that those nations benefitting from the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act of 1997 and profiting from our open markets, meet their financial obligations to the IATTC?

I urge my colleagues to support the George Miller of California amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) will be postponed.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution.

#### LIMITING AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the end of this bill, and we have had good progress so far. We are on the very last title, as my colleagues know, and there are only 9 amendments remaining, and in the interests of attempting to expeditiously move the bill and to finish the bill at an early hour this evening, I wish to propose a unanimous consent request:

That during the further consideration of H.R. 2670 in the Committee of the Whole, no amendment shall be in order except for pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking member and the following amendments which may be offered only by the Member designated, shall be considered as read, if printed, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto:

An amendment by Mr. KUCINICH numbered 1;

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL numbered 5;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY numbered 7;

An amendment by Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. DINGELL regarding FCC regulations;

An amendment by Mr. WYNN increasing EEOC, with a decrease in the State Department funds;

An amendment by Mr. HAYWORTH regarding U.N. World Heritage Sites;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding hate crimes;

An amendment by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois regarding law enforcement grants; and

An amendment by Mr. DINGELL regarding criminal records upgrade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SERRANO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I will not be objecting, I just wanted to ask two questions, one of whomever. Is it our intent on any votes that may be involved here to roll those votes or cluster those votes?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SERRANO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. The intent is that we will roll the votes until concluded and then take all of the votes at the same time.

Mr. SERRANO. And secondly, does the gentleman from Kentucky know if we could save any more time? Are there any of these amendments that the gentleman is willing to accept from our side without any further debate?

Mr. ROGERS. There very well may be.

Mr. SERRANO. But he is not about to tell me right now.

Mr. ROGERS. Time will tell, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SERRANO. Time is what I had in mind, and saving even more.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 273 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2670.

□ 1810

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agen-

cies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) had been postponed.

Pursuant to the order of the House today, no amendment shall be in order except pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking member and the following amendments which may be offered only by the Member designated, shall be considered read, if printed, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question and shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent:

An amendment by Mr. KUCINICH numbered 1;

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL numbered 5;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY numbered 7;

An amendment by Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. DINGELL regarding FCC regulations;

An amendment by Mr. WYNN increasing EEOC, with decrease in State Department;

An amendment by Mr. HAYWORTH regarding U.N. World Heritage Sites;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding hate crimes;

An amendment by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois regarding law enforcement grants; and

An amendment by Mr. DINGELL regarding criminal records history upgrade.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYWORTH

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYWORTH:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

#### TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any activity in support of adding or maintaining any World Heritage Site in the United States on the List of World Heritage in Danger as maintained under the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

Mr. HAYWORTH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has a simple purpose. It prohibits spending any money on any activity in support

of adding or maintaining any World Heritage site in the United States on the list of world heritage in danger. It is based on the provision in the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act, H.R. 883 which passed in this House on May 20 of this year by voice vote.

The World Heritage Committee influences activities that occur around World Heritage Sites by putting such sites on what is entitled the "List of World Heritage in Danger." As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, the World Heritage Committee has been attempting to extend the reach of the convention concerning the protection of the world's cultural and natural heritage beyond a world heritage site in an effort to influence activities around the site. Unfortunately, the World Heritage Committee has interfered several times in ongoing internal economic development permitting processes of sovereign nations, including a project on private land in the United States.

The World Heritage Committee, with the approval of the executive branch, has ignored Federal law and infringed on constitutionally protected private property rights by disrupting the National Environmental Policy Act process for a project located on private land. Under the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage Committee monitors activities in and around a site in danger, and the country in which the site in danger is located is obligated to aid the committee in this monitoring.

□ 1815

A site remains on the list of World Heritage sites in danger until the host country agrees to implement the committee's recommendations concerning land use around the site, which generates international pressure on the country to follow the World Heritage committee's recommendations. Policies implemented in accordance with recommendations of the World Heritage committee can limit the use of privately owned property, thereby reducing its value.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, will help stop international organizations from interfering in United States land use decisions.

Mr. Chairman, if one supports American sovereignty, I urge them to support this amendment. If one supports the constitutionally granted right of Congress to affect Federal land policy, I urge them to support this amendment. If one supports the American Land Sovereignty Act, I urge them to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to vote yes on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. SERRANO. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to yield that time to the gentleman from Minnesota